

App. No. 09/862,390
Amendment dated October 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2004

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 10, 2004 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1-33 were pending in this application before submission of this paper. Claims 1-33 were rejected by the Office Action. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 31-33 are amended. Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15, 18-20, 23-25 and 28-30 are cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 31-33 are currently pending. No new matter has been added. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Specification Informalities

The Office Action objected to the abstract of the disclosure because of the strange graphic found on it, (i.e., customer number of Applicants' representative). Applicants have attached a copy of the abstract as an Appendix with the bar code removed. Thus, the objection to the abstract is overcome.

The Office Action objected to the disclosure because "flexibility" as found on page 3, line 12 should be "flexible." Applicants have amended the specification in accordance with the suggestion provided in the Office Action. Thus, the objection to the disclosure is overcome.

Claim Rejections

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24 and 26-33 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being over McInerney (US006727923B1) in view of Barneis (US006501966B1). The Office Action rejected Claims 5, 15 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McInerney in view of Barneis and further in view of Microsoft Outlook. Applicants respectfully disagree.

McInerney teaches the creation of internet location objects through the drag-and-drop manipulation of text. When an object is dragged from within an application into a system window, a drag object describing what is being dragged is passed from the application to the operating system. An application may be aware of internet location objects and, when an object is dragged from within the application into the system window, may specify that the object being dragged is a URL. Alternatively, the application may support generic text drag-and-drop, in which case the application specifies a text drag flavor as part of the drag object. Depending on

App. No. 09/862,390
Amendment dated October 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2004

the drag flavor, a file manager either causes an internet location object to be created directly or intelligently parses a text string that has been dragged and dropped onto the user desktop to determine if the text string is likely a URL. If a text string specified as part of a text flavor drag object is found to likely be a URL, then an internet object is created. Otherwise, a different behavior is followed.

Barneis teaches a voice recognition system that facilitates the use of voice dialing, and other safety and convenience features for use in a cellular or personal communications network environment.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a "method for providing shortcuts in a mobile electronic device, the method comprising: providing a shortcut data store configurable to contain shortcuts to a plurality of targets, wherein the shortcut data store comprises more than one type of target; monitoring a user's input to the mobile electronic device; determining whether the user's input is a shortcut input, wherein the shortcut input comprises a tag that identifies information in a data store; if the user's input is a shortcut input, determining a target of the user's input, wherein the target corresponds to the tag; and executing the shortcut using the information identified by the tag corresponding to the target."

Neither McInerney, Barneis nor any combination thereof teach the limitations of Claim 1 as amended. Specifically, the cited reference do not teach "determining whether the user's input is a shortcut input, wherein the shortcut input comprises a tag that identifies information in a data store; if the user's input is a shortcut input, determining a target of the user's input, wherein the target corresponds to the tag; and executing the shortcut using the information identified by the tag corresponding to the target." Thus, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claims 11, 21, 31, 32 and 33, as amended, include limitations substantially similar (albeit different in other important ways) to the limitations claimed in Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable. Thus, Claims 11, 21, 31, 32 and 33 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Furthermore, dependent Claims 2, 6, 7, 12, 16, 17, 22, 26 and 27 are allowable for at least the same reasons that the base claims on which they rely are allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

App. No. 09/862,390
Amendment dated October 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2004

For at least the foregoing reasons, Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 31-33 are submitted to be allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentably distinct. Applicants reserve the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200
JJF/ab